

San Quentin State Prison Condemned Inmate Complex Project Draft EIR
COMMENTS

(please hand in during the meeting)

Name: Kay Keohane

Organization (if any): _____

Address (optional): 5164 Paradise Drive

City, State, Zip: Corte Madera, CA 94925


The California Department of Corrections (CDC) has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Quentin Prison condemned inmate complex project. The EIR can be viewed on the internet at <http://www.corr.ca.gov/FacilitiesManagement/CICP>. CDC invites you to provide specific comments on alternatives and environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR.

If there is additional information that you believe should be incorporated into the EIR analysis, please identify what the issue is and the person we should contact about it. Thank you!

Comments

The EIR has determined that there will be a significant substantial and adverse change to the physical environment. Any other project subject to planning commission review would not be allowed to proceed under this kind of EIR. How can the state be allowed to proceed differently? The EIR did not address the cost/^{process} of upgrading the old facility and surroundings which would far exceed the \$220 million on the new facility.

Please, please mitigate the lights of the prison! They shine the entire way across the bay, and any new lights would be very intrusive in addition to the old. Can infrared sensors be used and lights reduced? Aren't prisoners locked up at night? Can trees be planted along the bay to screen prison? Most new projects require this kind of mitigation.

Thank you. 

Letter 84

Kay Keohane
No Date

- 84-1** The comment restates the Draft EIR's conclusion that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the environment. This comment is acknowledged. CEQA provides that lead agencies can consider significant environmental impacts and approve projects if there are overriding benefits. Lead agencies, including Marin County, do approve projects with these conditions.
- 84-2** The comment states that the Draft EIR should address the cost of upgrading the old facility and surroundings. No upgrades to buildings at SQSP are required to serve the project, although SQSP has been recently upgraded (seismic retrofits).
- 84-3** The comment asks whether other visual mitigation could be implemented to reduce the project's lighting impacts. Please refer to Master Response 2.

San Quentin State Prison Condemned Inmate Complex Project Draft EIR COMMENTS

(please hand in during the meeting)

Name: Linda Bundy

Organization (if any): _____

Address (optional): 89 Golden Hind Passage

City, State, Zip: Corte Madera 94955

The California Department of Corrections (CDC) has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Quentin Prison condemned inmate complex project. The EIR can be viewed on the internet at <http://www.corr.ca.gov/FacilitiesManagement/CICP>. CDC invites you to provide specific comments on alternatives and environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR.

If there is additional information that you believe should be incorporated into the EIR analysis, please identify what the issue is and the person we should contact about it. Thank you!

Comments

- ① Did not respond to problem relating to maximum capacity of new CIC being reached in approximately 20 years (25-40^{26.5} new condemned / yr). Plan for further expansion?
- ② Did not consider keeping old prison for use for rehab educational smaller death house only those with 30³⁰ execution dates now & 1/2 execution site and a shared regional use for rest of area - would benefit local and regional entities
- ③ Did not consider unique design for site - rather design is standard prison design - 3 choices: single level or stacked design, combination not considered which could reduce impact at shoreline and keep 57 employees housing and landscaping (add area by leaving out 2² buildings)
- ④ Cost to rehab old prison (which would be locked in if new CIC is built) not factored in to actual cost of locating CIC

Letter 85

Linda Bundy

No Date

- 85-1** The comment states that the Draft EIR does not respond to the problem of the CIC reaching capacity in approximately 20 years and states that the project should plan for further expansion. Please refer to response to comment 22-4.
- 85-2** The comment suggests that the Draft EIR did not consider alternatives that evaluated a reduced size in combination with local facilities. Please refer to Master Response 1 and response to comments 9-19, 9-21, and 9-22.
- 85-3** The comment states that the project does not consider unique designs but only standard prison design (single level and stacked design) and states that the project should consider a design that combines the two to reduce impacts to the shoreline and keep employee housing. Please refer to Master Response 2.
- 85-4** The comment states that the Draft EIR does not factor in the costs to rehabilitate the old prison with the actual costs of locating the CIC at the project site. Please refer to response to comments 9-31, and 11-3.

P Linda Bundy

Solution?

*Maintain old prison as center for rehabilitation, education etc.

* Change level of prison to accommodate new goal of rehab, education, training etc. Potential to end double cells if prison limited to inmates being phased out of prison system by means of preparing them for re-entry into society by giving them education and work skills

*Use current volunteer/education program at San Quentin as model to train personnel and expand programs to other prison sites

*Relocate Reception Center to ~~area more central in state or~~ to several sites

* Restructure Death Row to house a limited number of condemned according to their Execution Date (25-~~40~~/yr. given death penalty -- 1 every three years executed since 1976 -- 75-~~90~~ in for every ONE execution!)

120

* House majority of increasing population of condemned prisoners at other Level 4 prisons (all are now same as proposed new CIC at San Quentin -- the design is not different because prisoners are on Death Row!) To move a portion of condemned male inmates to other facilities would require a change in the wording of the Legislature's mandate to house male condemned prisoners at San Quentin but would not effect the actual wording for executions to be carried out at San Quentin.

*Keep death chamber and execution site at San Quentin

* Build medical facility to provide health services to reduced number of inmates therefore reducing costs for overtime personnel to escort prisoners to Novato Community Hospital and providing more secure treatment facility

* Maintain current employee housing

* Build more housing for employees to reduce traffic/travel problems (only 14% now live in Marin) and reduce financial inducements to hiring new personnel

* Additional housing could be provided to non-prison employees to provide revenue to state and needed housing in the area

*Relocate Ferry terminal to provide better access and service (would free up old site for re-use as transit center, housing ?)

* Opportunity to restore area from seriously degraded environment to one more appropriate to this unique geographical setting

Letter 86

Linda Bundy

No Date

- 86-1** The comment provides suggestions for the use and operation of SQSP. This comment is acknowledged. No further response is necessary as no issues related to the environmental impacts of the project were raised.
- 86-2** The comment suggests relocating the reception center to several sites. The reception center is not part of this project. However, please see Master Response 1.
- 86-3** The comment suggests housing small number of condemned inmates at SQSP and housing the remaining inmates at other Level 4 prisons. Please refer to Master Response 1 and response to comments 9-20 and 9-21.
- 86-4** The comment suggests building a medical facility to provide health services to a reduced number of inmates. Regarding reducing the number of condemned inmates at SQSP, please refer to responses to comments 9-20 and 9-21. Regarding a new medical facility, the proposed CIC includes a fully licensed Correctional Treatment Center that would provide basic medical services to the condemned inmates.
- 86-5** The comment suggests that on-site employee housing be maintained. This comment is acknowledged. If the stacked design option were selected and approved, on-site employee housing would remain.
- 86-6** The comment suggests that CDC build housing for employees and relocate the ferry terminal to provided better access and service. Although housing for CDC's employees and regional transportation facilities are important issues, the purpose of the project is to provide a new condemned inmate complex. Provision of housing and relocation of transportation facilities are not a part of the project.

San Quentin State Prison Condemned Inmate Complex Project Draft EIR COMMENTS

(please hand in during the meeting)

Name: Miguel

Organization (if any): CSUH Student.

Address (optional): _____

City, State, Zip: _____

The California Department of Corrections (CDC) has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Quentin Prison condemned inmate complex project. The EIR can be viewed on the internet at <http://www.corr.ca.gov/FacilitiesManagement/CICP>. CDC invites you to provide specific comments on alternatives and environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR.

If there is additional information that you believe should be incorporated into the EIR analysis, please identify what the issue is and the person we should contact about it. Thank you!

Comments

The non-point pollution - the more roofs & pavement there is, the more water runoff you will have. Where will this runoff go? Is there mitigation measures being considered about water runoff. How will this runoff affect the bay, streams, lakes? Mitigation

WATER USE - we need not to be selfish & assume our water supply is infinite. The amount of water being extracted or taken out of rivers exceeds the amount of water being recharged. The expanded facility will use, or should I say STEAL, huge amounts of water from everyone. If the facility is built, then water must be used, how much water can we afford to take?

Comments

If at the END, & the projects get an O.K., why do we have to build more prisons? Is it to keep the blacks, Latinos, & Asians from succeeding. Put all your money into better schools, K-12^{grad} & prevent these people from going to these prisons. Yes we already have people in the current prison & yes we have many bad people in the streets, but can we build a facility to educate inmates (more), to prevent citizens ~~to~~ from going to prisons, to ~~give~~ counseling to prisons, build rehabilitation to **BETTER HUMAN BEINGS**, remember they are **HUMANS**. Like YOU!

-----Please fold in thirds-----

To turn in additional comments that were not submitted at the meeting: Fold this page into thirds, tape closed, affix a 37 cent stamp and mail by close of comment period, November 12, 2004. Thank you!

Affix \$0.37
Stamp

California Department of Corrections
Facilities Management Division
P.O. Box 942883
Sacramento, CA 94283-0001
Attn: George Sifuentes
E-mail comments may be sent to: SQSPDEIRComments@edaw.com

Letter 87

Miguel
No Date

- 87-1** The comment expresses concern with the discharge of stormwater runoff from the project site and the quality of the runoff water. Section 4.8, “Hydrology and Water Quality,” evaluates stormwater generation and water quality impacts and recommends mitigation for the project’s significant impacts. Please also refer to response to comment 9-54.
- 87-2** The comment expresses concern regarding the availability of water supplies. This comment is acknowledged. As described in Section 4.11 of the Draft EIR, water use at SQSP (including the CIC) following construction of the CIC will be less than current consumption at SQSP.
- 87-3** The comment suggests providing money for education. This comment is acknowledged. No further response is necessary as no issues related to the environmental impacts of the project were raised.

Comments

A visual impact evaluation should be done from the Greenbrae Boardwalk Community which is located across the creek from the Larkspur Ferry Terminal, there is a whole community there whose views take in your project during the day and night. We have a peaceful, beautiful view over the water now, at night - The impact of your lighting would take that away from those of us who live on the Greenbrae Boardwalk.

ROBERT MOY

41 GREENBRAE BOARDWALK

GREENBRAE, CA 94904

-----Please fold in thirds-----

Letter 88

Robert Moy
No Date

88-1 The comment states that the Draft EIR should evaluate visual impacts of the project from the Greenbrae Boardwalk community. Please refer to Master Response 2 for a discussion of the visual resource impacts to the Greenbrae Boardwalk.